

4/1/77

Dear Karen,

Sorry about the situation but you have no choice. But the willingness, as always, means much.

Too bad you also lose your Sunday's. But in the end it will help toward law school.

As usual the clips are valuable and included what I did not see elsewhere.

This may be true with the newest committee nuttiness.

On deM my view is and has been that while he may have some kind of CIA association it: is not reprehensible but is normal economic-type intelligence; has no connection with the JFK assassination; and it was not possible for him to be any kind of so-called "baby sitter."

I don't really think that the CIA has improved upon native Haitian voodoo enough for George to manipulate Lee over all those miles of water and so much of Texas.

DeM had had to be ~~satisfied~~ confined in a psychiatric ward. I understand there were several rerent attempts at suicide.

Under these circumstances even the effort to interview could have triggered suicide. I think it did.

The struggle is getting grimmer in the spetro suit. We've not deposed Shaneyfelt and Gallagher in addition the Frazier and Cunningham. They are opposing further depositions and the judge is supporting them. We will not three more depositions and force them to a motion to quash and the judge to act on it.

As soon as we get the transcripts I'm going to start preparing an affidavit in the event it is needed. This will then serve as the basis for deposing me if the judge does not foreclose that I kind of hope he does but only because it gives us a better record on appeal. I'd rather be subject to cross-examination in all other aspects of making a record. In part this is because I agree with Wigmore on the engine for establishing truth, cited in the appeals remand, in part because I believe when there is cross examination people have more basis for confidence in the record.

It would cost more money, probably \$300-\$400 in court-reporter charges alone. It would also save me preparation time. Jim could question me from an outline.

Judging by the first two depositions it will probably be the end of next week by the time we have these transcripts. I've annotated the first two already.

Nothing else new.

Again tha ks and best wishes,

3-29-77

Dear Harold,

Things have been pretty hectic at work lately. A group of attorneys from California will be here for the next several weeks reviewing documents. Some of the paralegals that were supposed to come with them got tied up on other cases so myself and a couple others here who also hope to go to law school were requested to "volunteer" our help in looking for attorney-client privileged material. That "request" came while I was in the middle of another project for one of the attorneys here, looking for file indices in all the documents so he can prepare an affidavit as to what we have or haven't yet received. It's all really interesting, but very time consuming. All that is in addition to my regular daily work. I'm ending up taking work home with me. I get paid overtime for what I do at home, but it still puts a cramp in my free time. To top it all off, I promised my former boss that I would work at Kennywood on Sundays this summer so that he could schedule some of the other cashiers days off on Sundays. I must have been nuts when I told him I'd do it. The reason I'm telling you all this is because it means that I probably won't be able to work on the list of allegations - at least in the foreseeable future. I really feel bad about it since I already told you I'd do it, but I just don't think I'll have the time I'd need to do it right. I certainly hope that friend of Jim's is still willing to do it. I had already started working on an index to the Ray guilty plea before most of this came up, so I'm sure I'll be able to finish that & include it in the consolidated index, all

of which is finished except to be typed. I'll get that to you as soon as possible. I'm really sorry if this causes you much inconvenience or extra work. Believe me, I'd do it if it was at all possible.

Best,
Karen